

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 20 2007

F A X

William L. Botjer Esq.
PO Box 478
Center Moriches NY 11934
631 874 4826

To: **USPTO AU 2179**

Fax number: **571 273 8300**

From: **William L. Botjer Esq.**

Fax number: **781 846 8354**

Business phone: **631 874 4826**

Home phone:

Date & Time: **4/20/07 3:30 PM**

Pages: **5**

Re: **Election in SN 10/742,342**

APR 20 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Srinivasan**

Serial No: **10/742,342**

Group art Unit: **2179**

Filed: **12/19/2003**

Examiner: **Vuu, Henry.**

Atty. Docket: **RAG-005**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ELECTION AND TRAVERSE

Sir:


Responsive to the Official Action of March 21, 2007 Applicants hereby submit the following Election with Traverse.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the US Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed as below, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 571 273 8300, on the date set forth below.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: April 20, 2007 (Date)

By 
(Signature)

A. Election

In response to the restriction requirement, the applicants hereby elect to prosecute Group I, claims 1-12 and 24-26 (method/system for enabling an application designer to develop a UI) are stated in the office action to be readable on this group.

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth in the next section

B. Traverse

In response to the restriction requirement, the applicants have elected to prosecute Group I, claims 1-12 and 24-26 (method/system for enabling an application designer to develop a UI) are stated in the office action to be readable on this group..


. The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that restriction between differing inventions is unduly burdensome and wasteful of the resources of both the applicants and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by perhaps requiring separate filings, filing fees, office actions, responses, issue fees etc. for the filing of an additional applications. It is submitted that restriction between groups I and II is unwarranted for the following reasons. The inventions of groups I, II and III are sufficiently similar i.e. UI design, such that a search of the claims is likely to encompass the other class. Thus the search of the non-elected claims will essentially already been made and to require a possible separate prosecution of the other method claims is unnecessary and wasteful of resources.

Accordingly removal of the restriction requirement between the groups is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone the applicants' attorney at the numbers listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
William L. Botjer
Reg. No. 27,990
PO Box 478
Center Moriches, NY 11934
(212) 737-5728 (Tue-Thurs)
(631) 874-4826 (Mon & Fri)

Date: April 20, 2007